



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

JUN 14 2013

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Bryan Grant Jeansonne

Baton Rouge, LA 70806

RE: MUR 6682
Rufus Holt Craig, Jr.

Dear Mr. Jeansonne:

This is in reference to the complaint you filed with the Federal Election Commission on October 31, 2012, concerning Rufus Holt Craig, Jr. Upon further review of the allegations contained in the complaint, and information supplied by the Respondent, the Commission, on June 11, 2013, voted to dismiss this matter. The Factual and Legal Analysis, which more fully explains the Commission's decision, is enclosed for your information.

Documents related to the case will be placed on the public record within 30 days. See Statement of Policy Regarding Disclosure of Closed Enforcement and Related Files, 68 Fed. Reg. 70,426 (Dec. 18, 2003) and Statement of Policy Regarding Placing First General Counsel's Reports on the Public Record, 74 Fed. Reg. 66,132 (Dec. 14, 2009).

The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended, allows a complainant to seek judicial review of the Commission's dismissal of this action. See 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(8).

Sincerely,

Anthony Herman
General Counsel

Jeff S. Jordan /phl

BY: Jeff S. Jordan
Supervisory Attorney
Complaints Examination and
Legal Administration

Enclosure
Factual and Legal Analysis

13044334779

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS

RESPONDENT: Rufus Holt Craig, Jr.

MUR 6682

I. INTRODUCTION

This matter was generated by a complaint filed by Bryan Grant Jeansonne alleging violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the "Aot"), by Rufus Holt Craig, Jr. It was scored as a low-rated matter under the Enforcement Priority System, a system by which the Federal Election Commission ("Commission") uses formal scoring criteria as a basis to allocate its resources and decide which matters to pursue.

II. FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS

A. Factual Background

In this matter, the Complainant, Bryan Grant Jeansonne, alleges that Rufus Holt Craig, Jr. failed to include a "paid for" disclaimer on his yard signs distributed throughout Louisiana's 6th congressional district.¹ According to the Complaint, "campaign materials" must state "who paid for such materials," and that Craig's "failure" to include that information appears to be a violation of the Act and Commission regulations. Compl. at 1. The Complaint includes a photograph of what appears to be a Craig yard sign, which includes the text "RUFUS CRAIG, CONGRESS, VOTERUFUSCRAIG.COM," but does not include a disclaimer stating who paid for and authorized the sign. *Id.* at 2.

In response, Craig acknowledges that he "failed to place the appropriate 'paid for' language on [his] yard signs," and states that "it was not an intentional act," but rather the result

¹ Craig was an unsuccessful candidate on the Louisiana ballot for the 2012 general election. He was also an unsuccessful candidate for the same congressional district in 2004. The 2004 committee was administratively terminated on May 19, 2006.

13044334780

1 of his "failure to familiarize [himself] with the regulations for political campaign signs."² Resp.
2 at 1. Craig did not register with the Commission as a federal candidate and did not file a
3 Statement of Organization or any disclosure reports during the 2012 election cycle.

4 **B. Legal Analysis**

5 Whenever any person "makes a disbursement for the purpose of financing
6 communications expressly advocating the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate" he
7 or she must affix an appropriate disclaimer to the communication. 2 U.S.C. § 441d(a); *see also*
8 11 C.F.R. § 110.11(a).

9 In assessing the potential magnitude of the activity at issue, the Commission notes that
10 since Craig may not have exceeded the \$5,000 filing threshold for either contributions or
11 expenditures, the amount of funds he may have used to create and distribute the yard signs was
12 likely minimal. Moreover, members of the public who viewed the yard signs were unlikely to
13 have been misled as to who paid for the signs, given that the signs show the candidate's website,
14 which in turn bears the disclaimer, "Paid for by Rufus H. Craig." *See* n. 2. Therefore, the
15 Commission dismisses this matter pursuant to *Heckler v. Chaney*, 470 U.S. 821 (1985).

² Although Craig's response does not allude to his campaign website, his website displayed on the yard sign, <http://www.voterufuscraig.com/>, bears the disclaimer, "Paid for by Rufus H. Craig" (last visited February 14, 2013). The website does not reveal the existence of a political committee, but does give potential donors the opportunity to contribute to Craig's candidacy through a link.